

FILED
2019 APR 05
KING COUNTY
SUPERIOR COURT CLERK

CASE #: 19-2-09450-8 SEA

**Superior Court of Washington
For King County**

SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT

Petitioner

vs.

PUTNAM, HEATH (AKA: Joshua Heath Putnam) 5/30/1970

Respondent

DOB

No. **19-2-09450-8 SEA**

**Petition for an Extreme Risk
Protection Order
(PT)**

General Information

- 1.A ☐ I am a family or household member of the respondent. My relationship with the respondent is (check all that apply):
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Spouse or former spouse | <input type="checkbox"/> Blood relation other than parent or child |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Parent of a child in common | <input type="checkbox"/> Current or former legal guardian |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current or former domestic partner | <input type="checkbox"/> Stepparent or stepchild |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current or former cohabitant within the past year | <input type="checkbox"/> Parent or child |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Current or former dating relationship | <input type="checkbox"/> In-law |

- 1.B ☒ I am filing on behalf of SEATTLE POLICE DEPARTMENT law enforcement agency.
- ☐ I have already notified the respondent's family or household members and any known 3rd parties who may be at risk of violence; OR
- ☒ My agency will make a good faith effort to provide notice to them by ☒ telephone ☐ email ☐ in-person ☐ other _____ within a reasonable period of time.

2. ☐ I reside in this county.
- ☒ I am filing on behalf of a law enforcement agency that is located in this county.
- ☐ The respondent resides in this county.

3. Describe below any firearms the respondent currently owns, possesses, has custody of or controls.

Type of firearm	How many firearms?	Where is the firearm kept?	Date/time/place you last saw the firearm
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Handgun	2	UNKNOWN – Mentioned in SPD Case #19-120210	
<input type="checkbox"/> Shotgun / Rifle			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assault Rifle	1	UNKNOWN – Mentioned in SPD Case #19-120210	

Check all the boxes that apply and describe below:

- ☐ Respondent has access to someone else's firearm.
- ☐ Respondent expressed an intent to obtain a firearm.
- ☐ Respondent has unlawfully or recklessly used, displayed, or brandished a firearm.
- ☐ Respondent recently acquired a firearm.

Describe:

4. Between the respondent and me: List any criminal or civil protection, restraining or no-contact orders, pending lawsuits, or other legal action: *If you have more than three matters, list details on additional sheet.*

	Case #1	Case #2	Case #3
Case Name			
Case Number			
Court/County/ State			
Type of Case			
Protected Person			
Was there any order violation?			

5. Between the respondent and any other person: List any criminal or civil protection, restraining or no-contact orders: *If you have more than three matters, list details on additional sheet.*

	Case #1	Case #2	Case #3
Protected Person			
Case Number			
Court/County/ State			
Was there any order violation?			

6. Request for an Extreme Risk Protection Order

☒ I want a temporary extreme risk protection order effective immediately, without prior notice to respondent, that lasts up to 14 days, or until the court hearing:

These are the specific facts known to me that cause me to believe the respondent poses a **significant danger in the near future** of causing personal injury to self or others by having custody or control, purchasing, possessing, or receiving firearms. More detailed information is provided in the Statement in section 7.

On the early morning hours of 04/04/19, SPD Patrol Officers responded to Northwest Hospital in response to a 911 call made by their Social Worker Unit. The 911 call indicated that PUTNAM was currently being evaluated by psychiatrists after his girlfriend brought him in for having homicidal ideations of carrying out a mass shooting. The 911 call also indicated that PUTNAM owns firearms that are stored in his home.

Officers conducted an investigation at NW Hospital to include interviews with PUTNAM, his girlfriend and on-site hospital staff. Officers determined that PUTNAM's behavior met the criteria for an emergent detention based on the circumstances that PUTNAM possibly suffered from mental illness and that he posed likely imminent danger to others by way of a mass shooting. Officers determined that NW Hospital could conduct a mental health evaluation; and Officers subsequently completed emergent detention documentation to hold PUTNAM involuntarily at the hospital. See Section 7 for full details of the on-scene Police investigation (SPD Case#19-120210).

After a hearing, where the respondent has a right to be present, I want the court to issue an Extreme Risk Protection Order that lasts for one year:

After the hearing, I want the court to issue an Extreme Risk Protection Order that lasts for one year because the respondent poses a significant danger of causing personal injury to self or others by having custody or control, purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm.

My statement below includes the respondent's specific words, actions, or other facts that cause me to have a reasonable fear of **future** dangerous acts by respondent.

7. Statement

To enter an Extreme Risk Protection Order, the court must find it more likely than not that the respondent poses a significant danger of causing personal injury to self or others by having custody or control, purchasing, possessing, or receiving a firearm.

Based upon the totality of circumstances, PUTNAM was evaluated for the petitioning of an Extreme Risk Protection Order utilizing the standardized vetting process developed by SPD Crisis Response Unit. Extreme Risk Protection Orders are designed to temporarily prevent individuals who are at a high risk of harming themselves or others from accessing firearms when there is demonstrated evidence that the person poses a significant danger, including a danger as a result of a dangerous mental health crisis OR violent behavior.

The SPD Crisis Response Unit believes a preponderance of the evidence demonstrates that PUTNAM poses a significant danger of causing personal injury to self by having in his custody, purchasing, possessing or receiving a firearm based on the following:

SPD Case#19-120210 – On 04/04/19 at approximately 2233 Hrs, SPD Patrol Officers responded to NW Hospital to investigate the following 911 complaint called in by the on-duty Charge Nurse:

"IN THE ER, MALE BEING EVALUATED BY DOCTORS/PSYCHIATRIST, TOLD HIS GIRLF HE PLANNED TO DO A MASS SHOOTING SIMILAR TO LAS VEGAS, DID NOT HAVE PLAN, UNK IF DIAGNOSES, NO WEAPNS ON HIM NOW BUT ADVISED HE HAS GUNS AT HOME HE PLANS TO USE, EVERYTHING UNDER CONTROL"

The following are a synopsis of the on-scene Police investigation:

- Officers spoke with the Charge Nurse who reported that PUTNAM's girlfriend, Anna Novak reported to the Charge Nurse that PUTNAM made several comments of wanting to commit a mass shooting that would outdo the Las Vegas shooter. She also reported that she was the one who brought PUTNAM to a hospital voluntarily.
- Officers spoke with the doctor that evaluated PUTNAM, who learned that he has two handguns and one bolt action rifle at his residence that he access to. The doctor remarked that PUTNAM was "cold, calculative and manipulative." And that he was "very intelligent" to "know what to say to get where he wants." The doctor also remarked that PUTNAM was worried that the "government would come to take his guns away." The doctor also reported that Ms. Novak reported to him that PUTNAM had an ideology of shooting Muslim in order to further the white race. The doctor also reported that PUTNAM stated that he did not plan on hurting anyone at the time, but that PUTNAM also stated that he did not know how things may change in the future.
- Officers attempted to speak with PUTNAM, but he elected not to speak with Officers without a lawyer present.
- Officers spoke with the Ms. Novak, who was somewhat reluctant to speaking with Officers. However, she did disclose some relevant information, such as her belief that PUTNAM is a "paranoid schizophrenic." She also stated that she and PUTNAM had been dating since 2014 and that PUTNAM recently lost his job 5 months prior, causing PUTNAM to be depressed. Ms. Novak reported that she believes that PUTNAM needs mental health treatment, but that he is reluctant to go and that it took her weeks to convince PUTNAM to go with her to NW Hospital on this incident. Ms. Novak would not disclose to Officers the statements she heard PUTNAM make, but when asked about statements that might have alerted hospital staff, she relented and stated that PUTNAM had made remarks about wanting "52 or 53 bodies, like Tarantino (the New Zealand shooter)." Ms. Novak attempted to be dismissive of the severity of the statements and added that PUTNAM was only verbalizing a mass shooting fantasy, where he views himself as a "hero."
- Based on the totality of the circumstances, Patrol Officers determined that PUTNAM's behavior met the criteria for an emergent detention for a further involuntary mental health evaluation.

I spoke with DCR's Gamble and Kallay from the King County Crisis and Commitment Office. They confirmed to me that they did in fact assess PUTNAM at NW Hospital and that they did not hold PUTNAM for further evaluation and instead opted to arrange a next-day outpatient appointment with Harborview Medical Center. DCR Gamble relayed to me notes from the assessment that stated that PUTNAM exhibited little motivation to carry out any of the alleged homicidal statements and that they were not able to connect the potential for violence with an acute mental health issue – which would be the criteria that DCR's require for further involuntary treatment. It should be noted that the petitioning for an ERPO does not require an associated acute mental health issue to be present.

DCR Kallay informed me that he was the DCR that actually assessed PUTNAM. He informed me that during his assessment with PUTNAM, that PUTNAM made depressive statements, but that he never made or admitted to making any statements of harm to others. DCR Kallay also went on to state that all the statements about fantasies of harming minority groups and mass shootings originated from Ms. Novak only. DCR Kallay stated that he did not think that PUTNAM should have firearms, but that it was due to DCR Kallay's assessment that PUTNAM might one day commit suicide instead of homicide. DCR Kallay also did not believe that there was an imminent danger to self or others and that was the reason he opted to refer PUTNAM for outpatient services.

I spoke with Ms. Novak via phone, who described the incident as traumatic for her relationship with PUTNAM and for PUTNAM. She confirmed that the DCR's recommended outpatient therapy. I received the impression that she believed that the entire hospital-Police-DCR response was unnecessary.

Complete all sections that apply.

8. Convictions or Arrests. Check all the boxes that apply and describe below:

Respondent has been arrested or convicted of a:

- ☐ domestic violence crime.
☐ felony or violent crime.

Describe (Include location, court name, and case number, if known.)

9. Violence: Check each box that applies and explain below.

- ☒ Respondent has recently committed or threatened violence against self or others, whether or not respondent had a firearm.
- ☐ Respondent has shown, within the past 12 months, a pattern of acts or threats of violence, which can include violent acts against self or others.
- ☐ Respondent has a history of use, attempted use, or threatened use of physical force against another person.
- ☐ Respondent has a history of stalking another person.

Explain:

Date/When	Describe what happened.
4/4/19	SPD Case#19-120210
	Respondent's girlfriend brought the respondent to NW Hospital for a mental health evaluation. Girlfriend reports that the respondent made statements to her about committing a mass shooting, possibly toward minority groups.
4/5/19	SPD EVENT #19 CALLED IN BY NW HOSPITAL STAFF AT 11:42 AM
	THEY RECEIVED A CALL FROM MS. NOVAK INFORMING THEM
	THAT PUTNAM IS "ESCALATING."
10. Respondent's mental health	
Describe any dangerous mental health issues of the respondent.	
Girlfriend believes that Respondent suffers from mental health issues and that he is a "paranoid schizophrenic."	
DCR's did not establish an acute mental health issue. DCR's however did remark that the respondent was depressed and would benefit from additional outpatient psychiatric care.	

11. Corroborated evidence of respondent's alcohol or controlled substance abuse.

Describe any evidence and attach any documents corroborating (supporting) the respondent's abuse of alcohol, legal or illegal drugs.

N/A


12. Other important information that you think will help the court make a decision.**13. You must provide an address where you can be served with legal documents. Chose ONE option then write the address in the line below:**

- ☐ I can be served with legal documents at the address below: OR
- ☐ Disclosing my residential address would risk harm to me or a member of my family or household. I can be served with legal documents at the alternate address below: OR
- ☒ I am filing on behalf of a law enforcement agency. Service can be made at the law enforcement agency address listed below:

Address: Seattle Police Department 610 Fifth Ave, Seattle, WA 98124

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the state of Washington that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: 4/5/19 at SEATTLE, Washington.


Signature of Petitioner

Officer Louis Chan 7424

Print Name and if Law enforcement Badge No.